

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended based on, for example, page 9 of the specification.

Entry of the above amendments is respectfully requested.

I. Response to Nonstatutory Obviousness-type Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-11 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claim 1 of US Patent 7,250,226.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11 are not obvious based on claim 1 of US Patent 7,250,226.

Claim 1 of US Patent 7,250,226 recites not just triphenylamine but also triphenylamine derivatives, triophene derivatives, benzene derivatives, styrene derivatives, and fluorene derivatives. However, claim 1 of US 7,250,226 does not recite the specific monomer unit of claim 1 of the present application.

In addition, since claim 1 of US Patent 7,250,226 discloses various derivatives, arguably, there is no particular reason to select triphenylamine as a genus to arrive at the claimed compounds. Specifically, when considering whether the present invention would have been an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of a patent, the disclosure of the patent may not be used as prior art. Accordingly, in this case, one of ordinary skill in the art would not select the genus triphenyl amine to arrive at the claimed species based on claim 1 since claim 1 broadly recites various compounds. That is, in view of the broad category of compounds recited in claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not envisage or arrive at the claimed compounds.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

II. Response to Rejection of Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tokito (2003/0091862).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that Tokito does not disclose the polymer compound having a monomer unit represented by formula (3) or (5), as recited in claim 1. Particularly, the polymer compound having a monomer unit represented by formula (5) is different from the structure of the monomer unit disclosed in Tokito.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Tokito fails to anticipate or render obvious claim 1.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention provides unexpected results. For example, the monomer derived from the unit represented by formula (3) is viTPD (1-1) and viPMTDP (2-1) used in Examples 3-8. The light emitting devices produced by using the monomer derived from the unit represented by formula (3) exhibited low emission starting voltages, high maximum luminance, and high external quantum efficiencies as compared with the light emitting devices in the Comparative Example using a polymer having a vinylcarbazole hole transporting moiety. Particularly, the light emitting devices using the monomer viPMTDP (2-1) derived from the unit represented by formula (4) exhibited further improved performance than when the light emitting devices using the monomer viTPD (1-1) (*see* Examples 4 and 6).

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Tokito.

Moreover, claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, and thus it is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Response to Rejection of Claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tokito and further in view of Hatwar (US Patent 6,127,004).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.


It is respectfully submitted that since claims 8-11 depend from claim 1, these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-11 is respectfully requested.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Keiko K. Takagi
Registration No. 47,121

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 3, 2009